DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 267 CS 502 434

AUTHOR Casmir, Fred L.
TITLE The Impact of Mass Media in the Pacific Basin.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Los Angeles, California, February 18-21, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Censorship; Civil Liberties; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Developing Nations; Foreign Countries; *Freedom of Speech; *Information Dissemination; *Journalism; Legislation; *Mass Media; Needs Assessment; News Media; Newspapers; Radio
IDENTIFIERS *Pacific Region

ABSTRACT

In many developing nations, governments have invested in media technologies to propel their nations into the twentieth century. These measures have taken an increasing social, financial, and cultural toll. Questions surround the right of developed nations to impose their commercially oriented values on those who lack the means to achieve such standards of living, as well as the loss of traditional values and culture, the widely expressed faith that communication will produce change, and the Western concept of press freedom as absolute, based on Western social and theological ideas. Freedom and democracy in developing nations should be evaluated on the basis of the nation's own development rather than on Western expectations. Interfering with information dissemination in such nations are such factors as inadequate technology, the high cost of materials, and language differences. Outside media have added pressures to nascent systems by creating false hopes and incomplete impressions and by exploiting the inadequate evaluative background of developing nations' people to deal with various ideas, interfering with the gradual, self-defined development of a nation. Debate also centers on whether commercial or political interests should dictate what should be presented on television in these areas. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED172267

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"THE IMPACT OF MASS MEDIA IN THE PACIFIC BASIN"

by

Fred L. Casmir

Pepperdine University

Seaver College

Division of Communication

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fred L. Casmir

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

presented to:

Western Speech Communication Convention
Los Angeles, California
February, 1979

CS502434

During the final months of 1977, as part of an extended study-tour of the Pacific Basin, I visited India. On one of my side trips to the impressive castles and palaces near Agra, dating to the days of the Mogul emperors, the visit was made more meaningful by a well informed, very personable guide, who in addition spoke excellent English. As historic facts and personal anecdotes helped shape my impressions of what I was seeing, the guide suddenly directed my attention to the movie camera I had been using. With a smile he said: "You probably think this is a movie camera. But it is really an elephant." By this time I had become aware enough of the special insights and gifts my guide possessed and simply asked: "What do you mean it is an elephant?" His answer has remained with me ever since, because it applied to much of my work dealing with the impact of mass media in Pacific Basin countries: "We have a saying in India," he explained, "that it is fairly easy to buy an elephant, but it is a major problem to feed one." Very much aware of the cost of the motion picture film I was using, I could strongly relate to his example, although he did not realize that his illustration could be also readily applied to my research project.

In many of the lesser developed or developing countries, it has become clear that the "elephants" of technology which many governments bought, in order to catapult their nations into the 20th century, have become giants which take an increasing financial, social and cultural toll, as they demand more and more "food" of various types for their voracious appetites.

G.H. Vyas, deputy director general of All India Radio at the time of our interview, described for me this "unit of multiplicity" for which he had much of the responsibility in 1977 and which is, in effect, a government monopoly. Broadcasts in 75 languages appear to be an impressive number, yet there are more than 200 languages or dialects in India, many incapable of being understood by others. There are some 20 million radios in India, but only about 15% of those, according to Vyas, in rural areas, with most sets found in big cities like Bombay and New Delhi. In India, as elsewhere, all these figures represent studies in contrast.[1] As K.N. Singh of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in New Delhi summarized: "You have to have principles of communication strategy (how to reach farmers with technological advances, ED.) for various aspects of culture...Two, you must try to develop combinations of methods and all technologies, no one method. I think combinations can greatly affect communication. Selection here will have a tremendous impact on the overall communication effect."[2] The price-tag for the 83 stations of All India Radio and their programming alone is an annual 500 million Rupies. Nor should it be forgotten that this entire system, controlled and financed through government funds made a smooth transition with Mrs. Gandhi when she passed her "emergency laws." This is not, of course, a phenomenon limited to the lesser developed countries. The continuing changes in mass communication hardware are well documented, but there is an increasing number of scholars in many fields who are beginning to realize that much more than technological changes in communication hardware need to be considered. One among many such statements comes from a book which has become a standard work in the area of public relations. Cutlip and Center, in the 1978 edition of their work, are more cogniscent than ever of the changes we have seen occur and which become more rapid in the 1970's. They write of "...a paradox: unparalleled facilities, but increasingly difficult and complex in communication.[3]

This paper is a summary of a large number of impressions gathered in some 15 countries usually listed under the umbrella of the "Pacific Basin nations," from more than 200 experts in the mass media, education, and government, who reiterated the truth of my initial statements repeatedly. It is my contention that we have entered into a new period in our dealing with mass communication. The "feeding of the elephant" and the inherent problems which that suggests are now of major concern to many people in leadership positions in our world. Under this general heading, I include not only the cost, but also the kind of "diet" media technology devours and spews back at the masses.

The overall impact of modern technology was put into an interesting perspective by Mr. Sen Nishiyama, Foreign Affairs Executive of Sony Corporation of Japan" " . . . technology is the servant of man, if man is determined to be its master. That is a basic human problem rather than a technological one." He saw the challenges of technology as an inevitable development which man has had to face even from the days of his most primitive development. At the same time the user, the television viewer, for instance, was seen by Nishiyama as the individual who must decide whether he wants to "waste his time" by by his program selections, or not. The result of a free society will be, according to the Sony executive, a selective process which will result in survival of the best (as judged by the public). and the collapse or disappearance of the poor or mediocre. How difficult the determination of worth or value it, however, seems as much a problem in Japan as in the United States. To quote Mr. Nishiyama: " . . . now, if you are going to make some judgment on the artistic level, or some other kind of cultural level, we may run into problems . . ."[4] Defining those media messages which survive as "good," may be one way of solving the significant problem of media- or culture-domination, but there are responsible people who have their doubts that this should be the ultimate standard.

Professor Yu of the Mass Communication Department of Chinese University in Hong Kong, did not see any harm resulting from such cultural-impact-programming as UN proceedings transmitted via satellites, or other factual programs dealing with foreign affairs. Nevertheless, he did identify as a problem, often repeated by others during my trip, whether or not countries which control technology, such as Japan and the United States, have a right to "impose, even unintentionally" their commercially-oriented values on those who "do not have the means" to make these standards of living their own.[5] The overall impact of mass media may be welcomed by such intellectuals as Professor Puan Shareen Kamaluddin, the head of the School of Mass Communication in Malaysia's Mara Institute of Technology, who has had extensive exposure to the United States, its people, its institutions, and its value systems. But she too indicates that any culture must decide what is superior. At the same time she sees her own culture becoming more open-minded, less traditional, something she considers to be a positive and necessary change, something which others in Malaysia might question.[6]

In actual practice and by definition, the mass media are under the direction of members of the elite. Merril has written about certain papers in our world which he consideres to be "elitist" by Western standards.[7] I would like to consider the question of elitism in a more fundamental way. Journalists, publishers, editors, owners of television stations, radio

commentators, educators, media critics and many others connected with the work of mass media comminication, are certainly not representative of the masses of people with whom they try to interact. By reason of education, experience, exposure to a wide variety of events, and probably by reason of temperament, media specialists, in effect, are as much an elite as any other professional group. As a direct result, and this holds true especially in developing countries, the media are under the control of, or are guided and used by elites to accomplish their purposes. Many authors, among them Crunig, have dealt with this important yet often perplexing or resented aspect of mass communication.[8]

More important than a debate over the term "elite," and what the use of that term might imply semantically, however, is an examination of what communication, specifically mass communication, has accomplished. In the past, there has been a widely expressed faith that communication will produce change, and more communication will produce more change.[9] However, it is a major contention of this writer that both of these axioms are highly questionable. A number of studies in South America and other parts of the world have indicated that development and change produce a need for communication, but that there is little indication that communication is a primary factor in initiating change.[10]

These kinds of findings are supported by much of our recent work in persuasion, sender-versus-receiver oriented communication, and the study of attitude change, as well as work which has been done by specialists in balance, congruence, or dissonance-theory.[11] Several major conclusions have come out of all this work: People will selectively respond to messages or stimuli which they can understand, to which they can relate, which appear to meet certain needs they have, and which give them some assurance of dealing effectively with their needs or reaching their goals. If that is not the case, people will tend to ignore the messages or stimuli, or will become resentful, bitter, and even revolutionary in their reactions against the message, the stimulus, and often against those who, because of unmet expectations, present the message. Much of this basic work in studying human behavior and persuasion can be readily related to the findings resulting from my work in the Pacific Basin. Obviously communication is a complex, or multiplex, interactional part of our lives. It would thus be foolish to assume that there is one set of explanations or definitions for all of it. But the observations selected for this paper fit in with the total picture produced by our research in other areas.

One additional preconception, or fundamental idea, also needs to be considered as the specific responses by the individuals cited here are evaluated. One of the important contributions General Systems theorists have made, along with theorists in such areas as Gestalt Psychology, Cybernetics, and Information Theory, is the need to understand the interactional aspects of mass communication and total environment in which they develop. There appear to be ethnocentric concepts attached to mass media by the representatives of Western cultures, which initiated much of the electronic and technological revolution, which in turn produced our existing and developing hardware. There is an assumption, often unsupported, that American concepts of freedom, freedom of the press, freedom of expression, use of the media for education, entertainment, etc., are inherent properties of these media, or are generally accepted as social laws, almost similar to laws we have developed in the area of the natural sciences. The

writers of the American Constitution provided us with a significant heritage, but it was, or is, also a heritage which started with the clearly stated pre-supposition that our "rights" are God-given. In other words, an entire conceptual framework, including the existence and role of a divine being, is very much at the source of the concepts relating to mass media which we have developed in the U.S. Nor has this concept of freedom ever been an absolute one. No society with which I am familiar has ever had a completely free system of communication, there always have been some limitations under some circumstances. The only differences between nations and cultures have been the reasons given as to why such proposed or assumed freedoms should be limited. Certainly the entire concept of "social responsibility" in the use of mass media, developed in the United States, is one specific attempt to define acceptable limitations to freedom. One thing appears clear after traveling through the Pacific Basin area: the four theories of the press, originally proposed in a well known book, may not be a sufficient list today. Lent would appear to provide a meaningful position when he suggests another, fifth, theoretical approach. This approach would be useful in developing nations not yet skilled in the ways of freedom or democracy, but which are working their way towards these social and political value systems. They should be evaluated on the basis of where the developing nations now are, not where a country such as the United States expects them to be.[13]

Lent indicated in Mass Communication-A World View

> It is true that most Asian nations guarantee freedom of the press in their constitutions. As true, however, is that numerous constitutions have been suspended or dispensed with on the grounds of emergency conditions, thus making press freedom in such countries only what the governments say it is.[14]

That is a simple, factual statement, which can be documented in a number of instances besides the Indian experience. Whether or not such events can be simply judged by prevailing American standards, is a much more difficult question to answer. Consider a number of varying views relating to control of the mass media expressed by the people I interviewed.

Peter Stewart, Chief Editor of the news department of Rediffusion Television Ltd. in Hong Kong, after acknowledging the peculiar situation existing in this city run by non-elected civil servants, indicated his concern because no one has the "statutory right to ask questions and expect answers." Out of that has developed, according to Stewart, a special responsibility of the press which at least some of the younger members are willing to accept.[15] In all cases it is clear that if there is some possibility of decision-making, power, or influence in a society, someone must, and someone will, assume that responsibility.

Sometimes, over the BIG issues, like first-amendment freedoms Westerners, and especially Americans tend to forget that there are other problems in other parts of the world, which have a more immediate impact on the dissemination of the news. Inadequate technology, high cost of newsprint, or language differences, result in tremendous challenges to the media. Even professionals in the same field, from different countries, have language problems. Robert Hutcheon, editor of the South China Evening Post in Hong Kong, who has had extensive international contacts, summed up one aspect of the language problem as follows:"...I'd say language is the big one (problem,

ED.)..because we've got different languages in each country of Asia and there is little communication between the various newspaper groups in, say, countries like Japan, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, The Phillipines, and Hong Kong."[16] In addition there are cultural, political, historical, and economic barriers which make contact between these nations even more difficult. However, we must not forget that similar problems can be found even within one nation, for instance India or Indonesia.

I was impressed with the challenges faced by the Republic of Indonesia. Islands stretching over some 3,000 miles, hundreds of varied problems produced by differences in language, culture, religion, educational levels, represent only some of the major difficulties. Cultures range all the way from stoneage tribes practicing animism to Moslems or Christians living in modern 20th century cities. Talking to both government officials and directors of private research-organizations in Jakarta, it became readily apparent that on one hand the government of Indonesia is attempting to bridge vast distances by use of a satellite, while on the other hand it could not assure adequate telephone services in its capital city. In talking to Mr. Rachmadi of the Department of Information, Dr. Suwardi of the University of Indonesia, Mr. Rahrdjo of the Ministry of Education's Communication Technology Project, it was repeatedly made clear that programs which assist in developing a master plan for all of Indonesia have somehow to serve all of Indonesia's constituents, some of whom are dedicated to establishing separate political entities. This certainly requires much more than the development of a technological capability. Jakarta-based, Jakarta-trained, Jakarta-instructed individuals are beginning to fan out over the entire nation. But involvement by receivers of the messages prepared by the central government, in a two-way or multi-way communication network is virtually impossible at this point.[17]

But we should not consider aspects of control only a problem in developing countries, because Japan and its very free system of mass communication (as is true in the United States) continues to struggle with some aspects of this entire question. Masaaki Kasagi, serving as Secretary-General of the Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Association in Tokyo, in September of 1977, faced the struggle of heading an organization attempting to enforce some standards, or control, over certain aspects of Japanese journalism from the "inside." His own perception was "Therefore, I personally think that sometimes the Japanese press is too free, you know, since the press is free, we can't control anything."[18] Professor Hidetoshi Kato of Gakushuin University saw the free Japanese press developing in ways very similar to those existing in the United States. Faced with a similar developmental history in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it was his observation that even such undesirable practices as the "creation" of news, and an overemphasis on international news, at the cost of relegating local or more provincial news to oblivion, have resulted.[19]

Many of these problems are internal. However, we must also consider "outside" influences. It is one thing, it appears to me, to provide information. It is quite another to add pressures on a nascent system by creating false hopes, incomplete impressions and give inadequate background with which to evaluate the truthfulness of information. This is especially true if such information is injected from outside a culture making difficult the meaningful, gradual, and self-defined development of a nation over a period

of time. It is my personal conviction that the mass media, as any other human social institutions, have to assume responsibilities not only on an abstract or philosophical, but also on a very practical contributing level. In such development they are partners, not observers. Journalists and others, in other words, must not only develop abstract theories, they must continue to use and prove them in the hard-fought battles for life and existence in which they share, not as "media people," but as human beings. Too often they are a member of an elite which is only slightly touched or threatened by the struggle of daily survival around the world.

The impact of television is an outstanding example of what existing technology can represent to the average person in a country. In many parts of Asia, including Hong Kong, investment in a television set represents a substantial percentage of an entire family's annual income, as much as $900 of a possible $4,500 in Hong Kong. Yet, as Professor Yu of Hong Kong's Chinese University's Mass Communication Department indicated, and as can be seen by anyone looking over the rooftops of Hong Kong, within ten years some 65% of Hong Kong's families have bought television sets, and most of them are now color sets.[20]

What kind of impact does this have? I was in Sri Lanka at the beginning of a special national conference dealing with the inter-relationships and future development of all agencies involved in communication in that small nation.[21] The fact that the leaders of the conference saw a need to define an overall policy for the entire country and for all communication agencies, was most encouraging. At the same time elected government officials, and others, were more concerned with my opinion as to whether or not Sri Lanka, one of the few countries without television services in 1977, should in effect invest in television. Politicians see television as an important medium for spreading information and exerting influence. They also see it as an especially attractive "gift" to give to their people. In addition, television, as is true of many of the other electronic devices now in general use in the West, has become a status symbol for the developing nations.

On the other hand, as officials in Singapore and in Indonesia shared with me, the question of setting up expectations and creating distorted value systems through the dissemination of messages unrelated to primary needs, or commercial messages, some of them relating to products which have to be imported from other nations, looms large in the minds of political leaders. Is Coca Cola really essential? India decided to ban it. Should the "jean's culture" of the West be allowed to control the life-style among the young people of Asia via television? Singapore through its educational television services decided to actively work against that foreign influence. But many political and educational leaders in the Pacific Basin have become concerned that the "every-day life" portrayed in American television productions, used to feed the voracious "appetite" of the imported technological "elephants," sets up unrealistic standards and unrealistic goals, which cannot be met by their governments now dealing with the basic problems of survival in developing countries. The resulting unrest, the resulting pressure for improvements similar to those achieved in the West, can become a destructive economic and political force, exerted either by those wishing to return to the "old ways" or those desirous to join what they see as the

"rest of the world."

Perhaps most intriguing is the dilemma faced by those who stand between two cultures. Ms. Suri Phancharoen served in 1977 as Program Director for Thai Television/Radio in Bangkok. She has worked for the BBC in London and is one of many women in Thailand making their influence felt. As she said "The whole purpose of broadcasting is that we must have information, we must have education, we must have entertainment."[22] There is government control over radio and television in Thailand, however, and she was active in helping the government develop its control-programs as much as possible in keeping with professional standards. Out of all those experiences she summed up her reaction to trends in the mass media in Thailand: "Well, I think that we are in a different part of the world. We have a different sort of culture, a different sort of tradition, we have different sorts of ideas in certain fields. So I think there should be a different sort of freedom, and a different sort of expression." She pointed out that in her culture it was considered very bad form indeed to criticize the royal family in a personal way, while in Great Britain that was a common experience. It is easy for us to assume as judged against our own cultural background, that this difference in values is in effect a negation of freedom of expression, a limitation on the freedom of the press. It would take considerable insight into all of human motivation to determine if that is the case. Our own tendency would be to condemn this point of view as being subservient to cultural or even governmental dictates. But I wonder? Are we not in effect as subservient to our concept of freedom-of-the-press on the basis of our own cultural pre-suppositions? Or are we simply saying that "we" are right, and "they" are wrong? Which cultural values must be preserved?

It is a worthwhile experience to hear others, equally sincere, equally dedicated to their ideals, equally dedicated in many instances to human freedom, express points of view which are different from our own, and to be forced to re-examine one's own pre-suppositions. Miss See Lai Tan of the Singapore Media Services is concerned with cultural imperialism, and sees it as part of her function to modify such influences:"...we are taking all kinds of measures at the moment to stop our people from adopting en masse some of the Western culture. For example, the government is trying it's best to get our young people not to accept the 'jean's culture'. ...So what we do now, at least in our Ministry, we have started a very big program called 'Education for Living'...the idea is that we do not want to be in the clutches of commercial people who dictate what we should see and what we should not see."[23] Someone, obviously, decides or dictates what people see. The debate as to whether or not commercial-dictates are better than political-dictates is certainly not over, neither in the Pacific Basin nor in the United States. As Mr. Rachmadi of the Indonesian Department of Information put it: "The most important thing is, of course, how can we make use of communication to develop a nation, because of the critical situation of the country, the population of Indonesia, the economic problems we have to face."[24] Obviously, such concerns can also lead to political control and oppression of the mass media and the people.

Dr. Rex Meyers, Director of the Center for Advancement of Teaching at Sydney's Macquarie University, who has done much work in developing countries, sees no great danger that <u>developed</u> countries will be overwhelmed by new

ideas coming out of the "great American think-tank." More developed countries have both the insight and the power to pick and choose. What about the developing nations, however? Here are his reactions: "If you mean the developing countries, however, I think here the dangers are very, very real, and very worrying. It doesn't matter whether the ideas are coming from your country or mine, or any other country, simply because the developing countries, the local people haven't the resilience to do what we did in going through an evolutionary process of understanding the dangers..."[25] Later in our conversation he continued this trend of thought: "But one of the dangers of the alternative model, which is to send in the expert from the particular project is that he is the new missionary, the new generation of missionaries, and a very dangerous person indeed. Because he is bringing into the country concerned a total conviction about the value of the materials, the ideas, and the philosophies of the particular project he is working on...He's there to sell,...because he believes that it is for the good of the nation concerned."

Human institutions will serve human needs or human beings will dispose of them. There is probably no more striking illustration of that fact than the case of India under Mrs. Gandhi. In spite of her restrictive laws and full control over the mass media, the people rebelled and succeeded in overthrowing Mrs. Gandhi's government. Anyone who observed the Indian press, as I did, in 1977, during the period of its rejuvenation under a new government, could not help but become very quickly aware of a response to its new-found freedom, which was almost as unbalanced as its fairly general surrender to Mrs. Gandhi. Freed from restrictions, the press began to nit-pick, began to cover small personal stories about government officials in excruciating detail. Not just once, but sometimes two or three times in the same issue of a paper. The new Prime Minister, his habits, his acts and those of his cabinet members were examined in great detail. The press, which in a majority of cases had simply gone along with Mrs. Gandhi's decrees earlier, now seemed willing to go to almost any length to give the impression that it was a real champion of democratic ideals.

The values, standards, impact of mass media, freedom of the press thus need study in the real world. When we speak of the press, we of course, speak of people. When we speak of organizations or nations, we speak, of course, of people. Communication of any type, as General Systems theorists would readily remind us, has to be seen in the framework of nations, cultures, people, environment or supra-, as well as sub-systems. Probably the most discouraging message that has come out of many of the developing nations in our world (as indeed is true in many of the more developed countries) is the fact that communication can bring about little change unless the institutions, values, and concepts of an entire society change with it.[26] Otherwise, as Grunig so convincingly argues, the mass media will be nothing but a means for whatever elite is in power to preserve and maintain that status quo which is expedient and beneficial to the survival of the mass media and the elite of which they are a part.

As we move out of a period during which we almost convinced ourselves that technology and techological advancement meant automatic improvement of the human condition, it becomes increasingly important not simply to discard but to reexamine the uses to which mass media have been put and will be

put. In part this would appear to call for a humility that few of us may possess. It requires that we reconsider, restudy and reevaluate the "precious" hardware and the equally "precious" software components of the mass media. This would represent the true spirit of science, allowing an ongoing search, an open approach, in spite of our culturally-encouraged striving for closure, or our search for absolute standards applied to the mass media. This requires, I believe, a new partnership of people from different disciplines, different parts of the world, making use of different methodologies.

FOOTNOTES

[1]From a personal taped interview: G.H. Vyas, Deputy Director-General, All India Radio, 10/3/1977, New Delhi, India.

[2]From a personal taped interview: K.N. Singh, Head, Division of Agricultural Extension, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, 10/4/1977, New Delhi, India.

[3]Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1978), p. 106.

[4]From a personal taped interview: Sen Nishiyama, Foreign Affairs Executive, SONY Corporation, 9/1/77, Tokyo, Japan.

[5]From a personal taped interview: Timothy Yu, Chairman, Department of Mass Communication, Chinese University, 9/15/77, Hong Kong.

[6]From a personal taped interview: Puan Sharee Kamaluddin, Head, School of Mass Communication, Mara Institute of Technology, 10/19/1977, Malaysia.

[7]Heinz-Dietrich Fischer and John C. Merrill, editors, International and Intercultural Communication (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1976), pp. 90-98.

[8]James E. Grunig, "A General Systems Theory of Communication, Poverty, and Underdevelopment," in: Fred L. Casmir, editor, Intercultural and International (Washington: The University Press of America, 1978), pp. 72-104.

[9]See among others: Daniel Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society (New York: The Free Press, 1958); Everett M. Rogers with Lynne Svenning, Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication (New York: The Free Press, 1969)

[10]See among others: James E. Grunig, "Information and Decision Making in Economic Development," Journalism Quarterly, 46 (1969) 565-575.; James E. Grunig, "Communication and the Economic Decision Making Process of Columbian Peasants," Economic Development and Cultural Change, 19 (1971) 58-597.; Gordon C. Whiting, "Individual Innovativeness and Agricultural Development: The Afghan Case," Paper Presented to the Rural Sociological Society, Denver, August 1971.

[11]It is not the purpose of this paper to explore sources in this area in detail, only a few, generalized references are, therefore, provided here from a large number of available sources: Frederic A. Gruber, "Why Empirical Methods Cannot Apply In Communication Research: The case Against Behaviorism," in: Fred L. Casmir, Intercultural and International Communication (Washington: The University Press of America, 1978) pp. 7-41.; Janice Hepworth, "Some Pre-Empirical Considerations For Cross-Cultural Attitude Measurements and Persuasion," in: Fred L. Casmir, Intercultural and International Communication (Washington: The University Press of America, 1978) pp. 42-71.; Robert E. Reinheimer, "A New Perspective On The Persuasion Process," Paper Presented to the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Newport Beach, California, November 1974; John E. Crawford and John C. Reinard, Jr., "Persuasibility; A Reception Yielding Process: A Nonmonotonic Theory Of Man's Reception Distortion Behaviors As A Function Of Environmental Fluctuations." Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association convention, New York, November 1973.

[12]See among others: H.C. Triandis, Attitude and Attitude Change (New York: Wiley, 1971); L.A. Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1957.

[13]John A. Lent, "Media Worldwide: An Overview Of Mass Communication," in: Fred L. Casmir, Intercultural and International Communication (Washington: The University Press of America, 1978), pp. 664-681.

[14]John A. Lent, Mass Communication-A World View (Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1974), p. 113.

[15]From a personal taped interview: Peter Stewart, Chief Editor, News Department, Rediffusion Television, LTD., 9/17/1977, Hong Kong.

[16]From a personal taped interview: Robin Hutcheon, Editor South China Morning Post, 9/16/1977, Hong Kong.

[17]From personal taped interviews: F. Rachmadi, Department of Information, Government of Indonesia, 11/1/1977, Jakarta, Indonesia. Harsono Suwardi, Chairman, Department of Communication, University of Indonesia, 10/29/1977, Jakarta, Indonesia. Raphael Rahardjo, Communication Technology Project, Ministry of Education, 10/28/1977, Jakarta, Indonesia.

[18]From a personal taped interview: Masaaki Kasagi, Secretary-General, Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Association, 9/2/1977, Tokyo, Japan.

[19]From a personal taped interview: Hidetoshi Kato, Department of Sociology, Gakushuin University, Tokyo, Japan.

[20]Yu, interview: 9/15/1977, Hong Kong.

[21]This conference began on October 18, 1977, the day of my departure from Colombo. However, I attended the firs. sessions and have since studied the conference transcripts. The conference involving all communication agencies was sponsored by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the East-West Center.

[22]From a personal taped interview: Suri Phancharoen, Program Director, Thai Television/Radio, 9/23/1977, Bangkok, Thailand.

[23]From a personal taped interview: See Lai Tan, Singapore Media Services, 10/25/1977, Singapore.

[24]Rachmadi, interview: 11/1/1977, Jakarta, Indonesia.

[25]From a personal taped interview: Rex Meyers, Director, Center for Advancement of Teaching, Macquarie University, 11/7/1977, Sidney, Australia.

[26]Grunig, in: Casmir, Intercultural and International Communication, pp.